



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,522	05/02/2002	Marc G. Jacquemin	522-1769	5981

7590 02/13/2004

William M Lee Jr
Lee Mann Smith McWilliams
Sweeney & Ohlson
PO Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

HADDAD, MAHER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1644

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/030,522

Applicant(s)

JACQUEMIN ET AL.

Examiner

Maher M. Haddad

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 27-48 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment, filed on 12/31/01, is acknowledged.
2. Claims 27-48 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

4. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 27-36, 38-43 and 48, drawn to a monoclonal antibody against factor VIII, a cell line, fragments, and a composition thereof.
- II. Claim 37, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding for an antigen-binding fragment of a monoclonal antibody having the capacity of at least 65% and at most 98% inactivation factor VIII
- III. Claims 44, 46-47, drawn to a method of treatment and /or prevention of a disorder of hemostasis, a coagulation disorder in a mammal with a monoclonal antibody having the capacity of a least 65% and at most 98% inactivation factor VIII or a complex of two or more factors involving factor VIII.
- IV. Claims 44-47, drawn to a method of treatment and /or prevention of thrombotic pathology condition in a mammal with a monoclonal antibody having the capacity of a least 65% and at most 98% inactivation factor VIII or a complex of two or more factors involving factor VIII.
- V. Claims 44, 46-47, drawn to a method of treatment and /or prevention of attenuation of coagulation in a mammal with a monoclonal antibody having the capacity of a least 65% and at most 98% inactivation factor VIII or a complex of two or more factors involving factor VIII.

Art Unit: 1644

5. The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The invention of claim 28 was found to have no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art of Lenting et al (J Biol. Chem, 269:7150-7165, 1994). (see entire document).

Lenting *et al* teach monoclonal antibodies specific for factor VIII such as CLB-CAg A, CLB-CAg 12, CLB-CAg 69, and CLB-CAg 117 against FVIII-LC and CLB-CAg 9 against FVIII-HC (see page 7150, under Antibodies, in particular). Lenting *et al* teach that CLB-CAg A is known to be a strong inhibitor of FVIII activity and has its epitope within the A3 domain sequence Gln¹⁷⁷⁸-Asp¹⁸⁴⁰ of the FVIII-LC (see page 7151, last paragraph in particular). Finally, Lenting *et al* teach that antibody CLB-CAg A effectively inhibited FIXa binding to the FVIII-LC (see fig 6, page 7154, in particular).

While the prior art teachings may be silent as to the “having the capacity of at least 65% and at most 98% inactivating factor VIII” per se; the reference product is the same as the claimed method. Therefore “having the capacity of at least 65% and at most 98% inactivating factor VIII” is considered inherent properties.

Since the office does not have a laboratory to test the reference antibodies, it is applicant's burden to show that the reference antibodies do not have the capacity of at least 65% and at most 98% inactivating factor VIII recited in the claim. See *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

Since Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

Species Election

5. Irrespective of whichever group applicant may elect, applicant is further required under 35 US 121 (1) to elect a single disclosed species to which claims would be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable and (2) to list all claims readable thereon including those subsequently added.

If Group IV is elected, applicant is required to elect a method of treatment and /or prevention of a disorder of hemostasis, coagulation, disorder or thrombotic pathology condition or attenuation of coagulation, wherein the specific thrombotic pathologic condition is such as the one recited in claim 45. These species are distinct because the pathological conditions differ in etiologies and therapeutic endpoints; thus each condition represents patentably distinct subject matter.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

12. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maher Haddad, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0845. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 to 4:30. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached at (571) 272-0841. Any inquiry of a

Art Unit: 1644

general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center telephone number is (703) 872-9307.

Maher Haddad, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
February 5, 2004


CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600